

Philip T. Emmons, Esq. (SBN: 124902)
 Law Office of Philip T. Emmons
 208 Normandy Lane
 Walnut Creek, CA 94598
 T: (925) 349-4029
 F: (925) 349-4029

CASEM

2010 DEC 10 AM 1: 06

CLE COURT

BY:

DEBUT CLERK

(925) 349-4029 CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE SET

Attorney for Plaintiff
Environmental Research Center

6

7

8

9

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MAY 1 3 2011 900AM

DEPARTMENT 212

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SEC-10-506061 10 Case No. ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER, a California non-profit 11 corporation, COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL PENALTIES 12 Plaintiff, [Health & Safety Code §25249.5, et seq.] 13 14 PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP, 15 TEXAS SUPPLEMENTS, LLC, QUANTUM NUTRITION LABS, 16 **HEALTH PRODUCTS USA, and DOES** 1-100, inclusive, 17 18 Defendants.

Plaintiff Environmental Research Center brings this action in the interests of the general public and, on information and belief, hereby alleges:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action seeks to remedy Defendants' continuing failure to warn consumers in California that they are being exposed to lead, a substance known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm. Defendants manufacture, package,

ì

distribute, market, and/or sell in California a certain products containing lead and/or lead compounds (referred to hereinafter as the "PRODUCTS").

- 2. Lead and lead compounds (hereinafter, the "LISTED CHEMICALS") are substances known to the State of California¹ to cause cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm.
- 3. The use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS causes exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS at levels requiring a "clear and reasonable warning" under California's Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Health & Safety Code ("H&S Code") §25249.5, et. seq. (also known as "Proposition 65"). Defendants have failed to provide the health hazard warnings required by Proposition 65.
- 4. Defendants' continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or sales of the PRODUCTS without the required health hazard warnings, causes individuals to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to levels of the LISTED CHEMICALS that violate Proposition 65.
- 5. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief enjoining Defendants from the continued manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or selling of the PRODUCTS in California without provision of clear and reasonable warnings regarding the risks of cancer, birth defects and other reproductive harm posed by exposure to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS. Plaintiff seeks an injunctive order compelling Defendants to bring their business practices into compliance with Proposition 65 by providing a clear and reasonable warning to each individual who may be exposed to LISTED CHEMICALS from the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS.

¹ All statutory and regulatory references herein are to California law, unless otherwise specified.

6. In addition to injunctive relief, Plaintiff seeks an assessment of civil penalties to remedy Defendants' failure to provide clear and reasonable warnings regarding exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 7. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Constitution

 Article VI, Section 10, which grants the Superior Court "original jurisdiction in all causes except
 those given by statute to other trial courts." The statute under which this action is brought does
 not specify any other basis for jurisdiction.
- 8. This Court has jurisdiction over Defendants because, based on information and belief, Defendants are businesses having sufficient minimum contacts with California, or otherwise intentionally availing themselves of the California market through the marketing, distribution and/or sale of the PRODUCTS in the State of California to render the exercise of jurisdiction over them by the California courts consistent with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice.
- 9. This Court is the proper venue for this action because the Defendants have violated California law in the County of San Francisco. Furthermore, this Court is the proper venue under Code of Civil Procedure §395.5 and H&S Code §25249.7(a), which provides that any person who violates or threatens to violate H&S Code §\$25249.5 or 25249.6 may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction.

PARTIES

10. Plaintiff Environmental Research Center ("ERC") is a non-profit corporation organized under California's Non-Profit Benefit Corporation Law. ERC is dedicated to, among other causes, reducing the use and misuse of hazardous and toxic substances, consumer

protection, worker safety and corporate responsibility.

- 11. ERC is a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25118 and brings this enforcement action in the public interest pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(d).
- 12. Defendant PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP is a limited partnership and a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11(a). Defendant PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP manufactures, packages, distributes, markets and/or sells the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California.
- 13. Defendant TEXAS SUPPLEMENTS, LLC is a limited liability company and a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11(a). Defendant TEXAS SUPPLEMENTS, LLC manufactures, packages, distributes, markets and/or sells the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California.
- 14. Defendant QUANTUM NUTRITION LABS is an entity of unknown form and a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11(a). Defendant SPORTRON INTERNATIONAL, INC. manufactures, packages, distributes, markets and/or sells the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California.
- 15. Defendant HEALTH PRODUCTS USA is an entity of unknown form and a person within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11(a). Defendant SPORTRON INTERNATIONAL, INC. manufactures, packages, distributes, markets and/or sells the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California.
- 16. Defendants Does 1-100 are named herein under fictitious names, as their true names and capacities are unknown to Plaintiff. ERC is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of said Does manufactures, packages, distributes, markets and/or sells the PRODUCTS for sale or use in California, and/or is responsible, in some actionable manner, for

the events and happenings referred to herein, either through its conduct or through the conduct of its agents, servants or employees, or in some other manner, causing the harms alleged herein.

Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this Complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of Does when ascertained.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 17. The People of the State of California have declared in Proposition 65 their right "[t]o be informed about exposures to chemicals that cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm." (Section 1(b) of Initiative Measure, Proposition 65).
- 18. To effect this goal, Proposition 65 requires that individuals be provided with a "clear and reasonable warning" before being exposed to substances listed by the State of California as causing cancer or reproductive toxicity. H&S Code §25249.6 states, in pertinent part:

No person in the course of doing business shall knowingly and intentionally expose any individual to a chemical known to the state to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity without first giving clear and reasonable warning to such individual....

19. Proposition 65 provides that any person "violating or threatening to violate" the statute may be enjoined in any court of competent jurisdiction. (H&S Code §25249.7(a).) The phrase "threatening to violate" is defined to mean creating "a condition in which there is a substantial probability that a violation will occur." (H&S Code §25249.11(e).) Violators are liable for civil penalties of up to \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65. (H&S Code §25249.7(b).)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

20. On February 27, 1987, the State of California officially listed the chemical lead as a chemical known to cause developmental and reproductive toxicity. Lead became subject to the

2.6

warning requirement one year later and was therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on February 27, 1988. (27 California Code of Regulations ("CCR") §25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.5, et seq.)

- 21. On October 1, 1992, the State of California officially listed the chemicals lead and lead compounds as chemicals known to cause cancer. Lead and lead compounds became subject to the warning requirement one year later and were therefore subject to the "clear and reasonable" warning requirements of Proposition 65 beginning on October 1, 1993. (27 CCR §25000, et seq.; H&S Code §25249.5, et seq.)
- 22. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based on such information and belief, alleges the PRODUCTS have been marketed, distributed, and/or sold to individuals in California without clear and reasonable warning before, on, and after September 13, 2010. The PRODUCTS continue to be marketed, distributed, and/or sold in California without the requisite warning information.
- 23. As a proximate result of acts by Defendants, as persons in the course of doing business within the meaning of H&S Code §25249.11(b), individuals throughout the State of California, including in the County of San Francisco, have been exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS without clear and reasonable warning. The individuals subject to exposures to the LISTED CHEMICALS include normal and foreseeable users of the PRODUCTS, as well as all other persons exposed to the PRODUCTS.
- 24. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have knowingly and intentionally exposed the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS to the LISTED CHEMICALS without first giving a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals.
 - 25. Individuals using and/or handling the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED

CHEMICALS in excess of the "maximum allowable daily" and "no significant risk" levels determined by the State of California, as applicable.

- 26. At all times relevant to this action, Defendants have, in the course of doing business, failed to provide individuals using and/or handling the PRODUCTS with a clear and reasonable warning that the PRODUCTS expose individuals to the LISTED CHEMICALS.
- 27. The PRODUCTS continue to be marketed, distributed, and/or sold in California without the requisite clear and reasonable warning.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Injunctive Relief for Violations of Health and Safety Code §25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in Plaintiff's September 13, 2010 60-Day Notice of Violations)

- 28. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 27, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- 29. On September 13, 2010, Plaintiff sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65 violations to the requisite public enforcement agencies and to Defendants PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP, TEXAS SUPPLEMENTS, LLC, QUANTUM NUTRITION LABS, and HEALTH PRODUCTS USA ("First Notice"). The First Notice was issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code §25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. The notice was issued as follows:
 - a. Defendants PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP, TEXAS

 SUPPLEMENTS, LLC, QUANTUM NUTRITION LABS and HEALTH

 PRODUCTS USA, and the California Attorney General were provided

 copies of the First Notice by Certified Mail.
 - b. Defendants PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP, TEXAS

SUPPLEMENTS, LLC, QUANTUM NUTRITION LABS, and HEALTH PRODUCTS USA were provided a copy of a document entitled "The Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR §25903.

- c. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by the noticing party or the attorney for the noticing party, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious cause for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h)(2).
- 30. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code §25249.5, *et seq.* against Defendants based on the allegations herein.
- 31. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendants at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use and/or handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the First Notice to the LISTED CHEMICALS, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §§ 25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
- 32. By the above-described acts, Defendants have violated H&S Code §25249.6 and are therefore subject to an injunction ordering Defendants to stop violating Proposition 65, and to

provide required warnings to consumers and other individuals who will purchase, use and/or handle the PRODUCTS.

- 33. An action for injunctive relief under Proposition 65 is specifically authorized by Health & Safety Code §25249.7(a).
- 34. Continuing commission by Defendants of the acts alleged above will irreparably harm the citizens of the State of California, for which harm they have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy at law.

Wherefore, plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, as set forth hereafter.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Civil Penalties for Violations of Health and Safety Code §25249.5, et seq. concerning the PRODUCTS described in Plaintiff's September 13, 2010 60-Day Notice of Violations)

- 35. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 34, inclusive, as if specifically set forth herein.
- 36. On September 13, 2010, Plaintiff sent a 60-Day Notice of Proposition 65 violations to the requisite public enforcement agencies and to Defendants PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP, TEXAS SUPPLEMENTS, LLC, QUANTUM NUTRITION LABS, and HEALTH PRODUCTS USA ("First Notice"). The First Notice was issued pursuant to, and in compliance with, the requirements of H&S Code §25249.7(d) and the statute's implementing regulations regarding the notice of the violations to be given to certain public enforcement agencies and to the violator. The notice was issued as follows:
 - a. Defendants PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP, TEXAS

 SUPPLEMENTS, LLC, QUANTUM NUTRITION LABS and HEALTH

 PRODUCTS USA, and the California Attorney General were provided

 copies of the First Notice by Certified Mail.

- b. Defendants PREMIER RESEARCH LABS, LP, TEXAS
 SUPPLEMENTS, LLC, QUANTUM NUTRITION LABS, and HEALTH
 PRODUCTS USA were provided a copy of a document entitled "The Safe
 Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986 (Proposition 65): A
 Summary," which is also known as Appendix A to Title 27 of CCR
 §25903.
- c. The California Attorney General was provided with a Certificate of Merit by the noticing party or the attorney for the noticing party, stating that there is a reasonable and meritorious cause for this action, and attaching factual information sufficient to establish a basis for the certificate, including the identity of the persons consulted with and relied on by the certifier, and the facts, studies, or other data reviewed by those persons, pursuant to H&S Code §25249.7(h)(2).
- 37. The appropriate public enforcement agencies have failed to commence and diligently prosecute a cause of action under H&S Code §2524935, et seq. against Defendants based on the allegations herein.
- 38. By committing the acts alleged in the Complaint, Defendants at all times relevant to this action, and continuing through the present, have violated H&S Code §25249.6 by, in the course of doing business, knowingly and intentionally exposing individuals who use and/or handle the PRODUCTS set forth in the First Notice to the LISTED CHEMICALS, without first providing a clear and reasonable warning to such individuals pursuant to H&S Code §25249.6 and 25249.11(f).
 - 39. By the above-described acts, Defendants are liable, pursuant to H&S Code

§25249.7(b), for a civil penalty of \$2,500 per day per violation for each unlawful exposure to a LISTED CHEMICAL from the PRODUCTS.

Wherefore, plaintiff prays judgment against Defendants, as set forth hereafter.

THE NEED FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

- 40. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates by this reference Paragraphs 1 through 39, as if set forth below.
- 41. By committing the acts alleged in this Complaint, Defendants have caused irreparable harm for which there is no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law. In the absence of equitable relief, Defendants will continue to create a substantial risk of irreparable injury by continuing to cause consumers to be involuntarily and unwittingly exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS through the use and/or handling of the PRODUCTS.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays for the following relief:

- A. A preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, their agents, employees, assigns and all persons acting in concert or participating with Defendants, from manufacturing, packaging, distributing, marketing and/or selling the PRODUCTS for sale and/or use in California without first providing a clear and reasonable warning, within the meaning of Proposition 65, that the users and/or handlers of the PRODUCTS are exposed to the LISTED CHEMICALS.
- B. An assessment of civil penalties pursuant to Health & Safety Code §25249.7(b), against Defendants in the amount of \$2,500 per day for each violation of Proposition 65;
- C. An award to Plaintiff of its reasonable attorney fees pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure \$1021.5 or the substantial benefit theory;

- D. An award of costs of suit herein; and
- Such other and further relief as may be just and proper. E.

Dated: December 10, 2010

LAW OFFICE OF PHILIP T. EMMONS

Philip T. Emmons, Esq.

Attorney for Plaintiff
Environmental Research Center